

Remarks

All independent claim, (1, 17 and 34) have been amended to emphasize that the text and data content of the automatically generated communication includes information for possible action by a recipient, which information is automatically changed depending upon the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in such information between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication. New claim 36 specifies that the information concerns an document associated with the communication.

Basis for the amendment is found in the specification with reference to the drawings, particularly Figures 17 and 18 which disclose the display of the substantively different texts and data providing different information for possible action by the recipient:

“the enclosed documents are for you to complete and sign” and

“I have sent the loan documents to you in the post”

according to the media or channel selected (email or fax).

In a telephone interview with the undersigned on April 4, 2008, requested by the examiner, the examiner indicated that he was inclined to allow the claims as previously worded, subject to further search and supervisor agreement. In a subsequent brief interview responding to a status enquiry by the undersigned prompted by entry of an unidentified status date (subsequently removed) on Private Pair database, the examiner indicated that he had then been prepared to allow the application but his supervisor had subsequently drawn the newly cited reference, Alam to his attention.

In the office action, the examiner rejects claims 1-2, 7, 17-18 and 33 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over previously cited Harkins (US 5,65,461) in view of newly cited Alam (US 6,104,500). (The reference to anticipation on page 2 is clearly a word processing error). On page 4, last paragraph, the examiner refers to Figures 2 and 3 of Alam and explains that the text and data of the fax input automatically changes to an email interface. (In that respect, it would appear that the reference is substantially cumulative)

Notwithstanding, it is applicant's position that Alam does not disclose or suggest any change in information for possible action by the recipient according to the media selected, as now claimed in the independent claims, such changed information being exemplified above.

It is submitted, therefore, that the rejection under 35 USC 103 cannot be applied to the amended independent claims and that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Furthermore, Alam does not disclose or suggest that any such change in information concerns a document associated with the communication, according to claim 36.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is now in order for allowance and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert W.J. Usher/
Robert W.J. Usher
Customer 04518; reg 30932
212 633 1076